EMBRY-RIDDLE Aeronautical University SCHOLARLY COMMONS

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Volume 9 | Issue 19 Article 5

12-8-2000

The Political Psychology of Photographic Images: Facts, Fiction, and Superstition

Editor

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp

 Part of the Multicultural Psychology Commons, Other Political Science Commons, Personality and Social Contexts Commons, Photography Commons, and the Social Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Editor (2000) "The Political Psychology of Photographic Images: Facts, Fiction, and Superstition," *International Bulletin of Political Psychology*: Vol. 9 : Iss. 19 , Article 5.
Available at: https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp/vol9/iss19/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Bulletin of Political Psychology by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Title: The Political Psychology of Photographic Images: Facts, Fiction, and Superstition
Author: Editor
Volume: 9
Issue: 19
Date: 2000-12-08
Keywords: Image, Photography, Self

Abstract. This article describes psychological research that might make it less likely that bans against photographic images in Third World countries are viewed by Western observers as products of backwardness and ignorance.

Ethnic and religious groupings in a number of Third World countries Issue and enforce bans against photographic images of living organisms, including humans. A common rationale is that the photographic image captures the soul or living essence to the detriment of the living organism that has been photographed. Another rationale is based solely on the interpretation of religious text, often a dogmatic insistence on the creation of the living image being reserved only for a monotheistic entity. Often Western observers--even those who assert the ethnographic integrity of diverse cultural practices and engage in multicultural relativism--directly express or intimate a sense that the banning of photographic images is somehow not correct, is backward, or plain ignorant. Yet, there is significant Western psychological research suggesting that such expressions and intimations may be off the mark. This research suggests that the very viewing of photographs of the self induces psychological effects that affect the self.

Delius et al (1999) have found transfer of training effects from photographic images to "reality" in pigeons for tasks not requiring complex or refined discriminations. Given that learning affects the self, the self is changed through experiences reactive to viewing the photographic image. Vandenheede & Bouissou (1994) have found that fear reactions of ewes may be exacerbated or attenuated based on presentations of photographic images of humans and sheep, respectively. The cognitive-emotional nexus of the self is, thus, affected with various consequences dependent on future intrapsychic and external challenges. Ziller (1990) has found that photographic images can activate attitudinal response in humans as a component of an experimental methodology, as Schlosberg (1952) did previously. Photographic self-images are featured in psychotherapeutic approaches that can affect communication, interpersonal relations, and self-evaluation in chronic schizophrenic women (Spire, 1973); narcissism and emotional catharsis in psychotic females (Cornelison & Arsenian, 1960); self-image in creative humans (Van Vliet, 1977); and self-esteem, self-consciousness, social (physique) anxiety, and body dissatisfaction in women (Thornton & Maurice, 1997). They also can help identify and activate dysfunctions in body images and consciousness in schizophrenics (Cicognani, 1966). And, of course, one must note the Eastern and Western furor about the power of the self-image and other-image in matters of sexuality, violence, and pornography (Byrne, 1998; Gardos & Mosher, 1999).

Western presumptions of error, backwardness, and ignorance seem based on the notion that the photographic image is either psychologically inert or are of no special concern. This asymmetry between socio-cultural belief and research findings suggests that the presumption may be more of a mirror image. (See Byrne, P. (1998). Fall and rise of the movie 'psychokiller." Psychiatric Bulletin, 22, 174-176; Cicognani, E. (1966). Studies on the perception of the photographic image in a group of schizophrenics. Neuropsichiatrica, 22, 635-645; Cornelison, F.S., & Arsenian, J. (1960). A study of psychotic patients to photographic self-image experience. Psychiatric Quarterly, 34, 1-8; Delius, J.D., Emmerton, J., et al. (1999). Picture object recognition in pigeons. Current Psychology of Cognition, 18, 621-656; Schlosberg,

H. (1952). The description of facial expressions in terms of two dimensions. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 44, 229-237; Spire, R.H. (1973). Photographic self-image confrontation. American Journal of Nursing, 73, 1207-1210; Thornton, B., & Maurice, J. (1997). Physique contrast effect: Adverse impact of idealized body images for women. Sex Roles, 37, 433-459; Vandenheede, M., & Bouissou, M.F. (1994). Fear reactions of ewes to photographic images. Behavioural processes, 32, 17-28; Can Vliet, K. (1977). Creativity and self-image: An odyssey into poetry through photography. Art Psychotherapy, 4, 89-93; Ziller, R.C. (1990). Photographing of the self: Methods for observing personal orientations. Sage Publications, Inc.) (Keywords: Image, Photography, Self.)